













## LITERARY.

From the Emancipator.

## ODE.

FOR THE FIRST OF AUGUST, 1838.

To JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER, the Tyrant of our holy warfare; this Ode, commemorative of the triumph of principle in the British West Indies, is respectfully inscribed.

Oh, read upon the glorious sea,  
That image of what man should be,  
So nobly great, so boldly free—  
Ye isles that gem the western wave,  
Heaven's gardens of old song!  
Though there the unfetter'd waters lave,  
And dash your palmy shores along;  
How long, amid your odorous groves,  
Where every radiant song-bird roves,  
Those free-born echoes have been broken  
By the sob, and anguish cry,  
By the groan, and deep, low prayer,  
Of the vengeance-seeker there!

Think ye that it rose in vain,  
That wild cry of Nature's pain,  
Like the bacchanal's loose cheer!  
Or the clanking of his chain,  
And his curse of tyrant-reign,  
Rose in God's all-tender ear;  
And up-called the hurricane,  
O'er the mountain and the plain,  
In its terrible career,  
With the dread tempest avenge,  
The avenger of his tear.

Isles of beauty, isles of bloom,  
Isles of blossom-breathed perfume,  
Isles of glory, isles of palm,  
Isles of plenty, isles of balm,  
Gardens such as Eden's were;  
Lovely on the wave you rest!  
Fabled isles of the blest  
Were scarce of you the harbinger!  
Around the sea-sea gales, that stir  
To fan away the tropic heat,  
Are as cooling, and as sweet,  
As the odors, that were air  
In Elysian gardens fair,  
For the happy that were there.

Lovely lands, if ye were given,  
Where eternal summer dwells,  
To mind the mariner of heaven,  
Who beholds the happy isles,  
From the mast-head, or the sea,  
As his lone watch he beguiles  
With some song of ocean free;

What a scorn the foe of Eden  
Long hath made you!—as he made  
Old Paradise—while he did redden  
Gushing food and silver stream,  
Playing in the moon's white beam,  
With the blood of many a weeper,  
With the corn of many a sleeper,  
Gush'd with many a bitter thong!

Isles of Beauty, what a glory  
Has hath made you, who hath crushed  
The cruel spider's head, all gory,  
For whose laugh those blood-fountains gush'd,  
In his triumph-years of wrong!

Fearful is the hurricane,  
In its horrid midnight reign,  
Where the sweet grove, and the forest,  
With wild crashes tell its coming;  
And its war-cry echoes sorest

Where the ocean-wave is blooming!  
But when last that tempest came,  
And beneath the lightning flame,  
E'en the jungle's beating frame—  
I beheld, on one lone isle,  
The negro mother calmly smile;

Though the day of doom seem'd near,  
And the tyrant quaked with fear,  
She beheld in each red glare,  
That fell so fast, so fearful there,  
The answer of her long-breathed prayer!

And when came at length the flash  
On her to a devoted dwelling,  
And she heard, as fell the crash,  
Sounds of woe, and fearful wailing,  
On the troubled tempest swelling,  
Then arose her song of praise;

And she sang a deep red gush—  
'Twas all reeking from the lash,  
And she laugh'd to see the blaze!

His dark eye on the billows glaring,  
How aghast e'en now you swart vassal!  
Sigh'd to see you sail advancing,  
O'er the wave, an ocean castle,  
With streamer gay, and fairy tassel;

For a vision so entrancing  
Ne'er to him had bodied woe!  
—Wid as those free waters dancing,  
Look once more! and list the peal—  
Such as ne'er the sons of woe  
Vollied forth—while he hath given,  
Loud, long, and free as air to heaven!

The scented Indian gales are given  
By a sound, unheard before:  
And the sun goes down at even,  
O'er a land of slaves no more.

By the sea's clear shining bloom,  
'Neath the palm and orange blossom,  
Where the citron was perfuming,  
And all tropic flowers blooming,  
Bent the Creole, in the morning,  
Her dark locks, in curls, adorning,  
O'er that Nature-polished mirror,  
Where, alas, there was no error,  
And she sigh'd her twin to mark,  
So beautiful—but ah! so dark!

Her baby slumbered on the rushes—  
It was fair, but was a slave;  
Merry as the morning thrushes,  
And begotten by it brave!  
But a tear of Nature gush'd  
Her dark lash, and eye to lave;  
For the Helot hue—oh God!  
Flower'd in that baby's blood!

But, beneath the moonlight's shining,  
When that morning sun had set,  
I could mark that eerie, twining  
Her babe's brow, with fairy net  
With all flowers and odors met;  
And her voice was clearly singing,  
Like the mermaid o'er the sea;  
While afar fell her woe-ringing;  
Smile, poor baby, thou art free;

And, the Indian isles among,  
Edoed forth one joyous song:  
We are free as the proud water  
That along the sea-sand dasheth!

And the sea, and the image of a daughter,  
Joyous now, our green isle splasheth  
With free spray, where once he taught her  
Deep to lash, the idle lasheth.

Now no more the lightning flasheth  
Terrible, but sent in vain:  
And no more the rent earth gasheth,  
'Neath the hell-born hurricane;

An avenger, which we prayed  
Might no longer be delayed!  
Rest ye temples! or, afar,  
Tear the lands where tyrants are!  
Rend the heaven-avenging flag,  
On the breezes, to rage!

But, ye temples, go your ways,  
Where the meteor-lancers blaze  
On the low isle, and the blaze  
On the strong rock, and the sea,  
Of old England, and the Free!

Queen of the Free! Like him who reigns,  
O'er the Universe enthroned,  
Thou hast Earth for thy domain—  
By thy realm the world is zoned!

Never doth the day star set  
With thee! the day star set  
Never doth he rise, where day  
Is not welcome, 'neath thy sway!

For thy rod, like his above,  
Is a sceptre, now, of Love!

Reign, oh reign, enthroned daughter  
Of Earth's noblest, fairest isle,  
That was born of the free water,  
Ocean not more free, the white!  
Like a star new-risen there  
On the moonlight of her glory,  
Reign, oh reign, victorious fair,  
O'er the isles so fam'd in story,  
And, upon thy spoils pillow,  
When thou sleepest sweet to rest,  
Sleep, for it is thine to rest,  
And thy mercy o'er the billow,  
Hath, for many a sighing thrall,  
Bowing to the earth, unbent,  
Like the rushing, or weeping willow,  
Giving cherishing wine for gull,  
And the oil of joy, for sadness,  
And for sackcloth robes of gladness.

And like summer lightning playing  
In the fair horizon, mild;  
With its thunders not affraying,  
That no longer rumble wild;  
Are the terrors of thy throne  
Seen to calm, to cool, to ease,  
Gleaming o'er the dark blue sea,  
With sounds of far-heard melody,  
Thunders, that in anger hurled,  
Shake the sea, the isles, the world,  
By thy virgin hand controlled,  
Grasped by England's lion bold,  
While afar—the rule of love—  
Flies her olive-bearing dove!

Dove of the Church, thy wing is free!  
Spoutless, 'neath its shadows, he  
The blest fold of him, who sent  
The sweet plumes, like her's that went  
To the floating world of yore,  
And the dewy peace-branch bore!  
And we hail the gorgeous day,  
When the chain is torn away,  
From the leading hand and heart,  
Of the Church's fair-tart part;  
Not with freedom shout alone,  
And the jubal-trumpet blown,  
But with all sweet praise out-poured  
To the poor's avenging Lord!

And, amid the storied aisles,  
Of England's old Cathedral piles,  
Let assembled choirs employ  
Cecilia's universe of joy,  
With holy diapason swell,  
This immortal praise to tell:  
Where now yet Te Deum rose,  
O'er Jehovah's vanquished foes,  
So energetic, so sublime!  
Be it like that glorious time,  
When, beside the red-sea wave,  
Sank like lead the Memphian brave,  
'Gainst our God that dared to rave!  
They were sunk in the sea,  
God had triumphed gloriously;  
And above his people's head,  
Beauteous was his smile, that led  
The column of his victory!  
God's guiding star, to light the free!

NOTE.—This ode must be considered retrospective and conditional, or, the contrary, as coding as the Poet's reject or pass the bill for unconditional abolition.

## P. E. C.

EXPLANATION OF JOHN 2: 15.—To L. W.  
FALL RIVER, July 10th, 1838.

MY BROTHER:—A writer over the signature of L. W. asks, 'how can the above passage be made to harmonize with the literal exposition of Christ's precept, "Resist not evil?"' The whole passage is: "When he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep and the oxen; and poured out the changer's money, and overthrew the tables, and said to them that sold doves, take these things hence—make not my Father's house a house of merchandise." See Mat. 21, 12, 13. Mark 11: 15, 16, 17. Luke 19: 45, 46.

EXPLANATION.—L. W. takes for granted the very thing to be proved, i. e. that Christ either designed or actually used the scourge to whip the men. There were sheep and oxen in the temple. Whips are generally used to whip beasts, not men. If L. W. says Christ made the scourge to scourge the men—let him prove it. There is nothing in the passage to prove it. Even admitting that he 'drove' out the men—this is no evidence that he designed or used the scourge for them. I deny that he struck the men, or that he designed the scourge for them.

Again, Suppose L. W. reads the passage thus:—He made a scourge of small cords and drove them all out of the temple, both the sheep and the oxen. (1) The Greek particle *ex* of this translation. (2) The connection demands it, for the men were in the temple after the sheep and oxen were driven out, and Christ told them to take these things away and not make his Father's house a den of thieves. (3) The character of our Saviour and his whole deportment through life, forbid the supposition that he designed the scourge for the men, or used it on them. I would enter my protest against that picture in some children's books, which represents Christ with a great whip cutting men over the head and shoulders. I believe it teaches a falsehood.

Again, If the passage justifies resistance to evil at all, it does not justify resistance to evil threatened or done to us—to our property, liberty or life—to our friends or country—but to our religion—to our GOD. Contempt of God, profanation of his holy name, desecration of his holy temple, (if it can be found on earth), are to be resisted and punished by scourges, feters, stocks, prisons, galleys, swords and guns. This was the construction put on this passage by our Puritan Fathers, when they punished Sabbath breaking, blasphemy and contempt of God, with fines, whips, prisons and death; by Pizarro, when he butchered several thousands of Peruvians because their Inca cast a monk's breviary on the ground; by Charlemagne, when he converted the Germans with fire and sword; and by the Papists, when they tortured and burnt men to cleanse the church of heresy. If it teaches resistance to evil at all—it teaches that the church is to be purified of soldiers, of slaveholders, thieves and robbers—of cheats, liars, adulterers, blasphemers, rum-sellers, and rum-drinkers—by whips, scourges, swords and guns. Is L. W. prepared for this? Does he think it teaches directly or indirectly any such doctrine?

H. C. W.

DISCRETIONARY POWER OVER LIFE.—TO A CONSERVATIVE.

FALL RIVER, July 12th, 1838.

MY BROTHER:—A writer in the Liberator, signing himself A CONSERVATIVE—(a taking name in these times, by the by.) complains that I do not state the question at issue in the peace discussion fairly. He undertakes to expose the sophistry of my statement of the question—i. e. DISCRETIONARY POWER OVER LIFE, OR NO POWER. He says this is not the question—but this is—Hence individuals and society a right to defend themselves against the wrong doer?

I know not what may be the question at issue in the mind of A Conservative; but this is not the question at issue with radical peace men—i. e. true peace men. They do not doubt that men have a right to defend themselves, their property, liberty, lives, their fellow beings and their religion. All men have a right to defend themselves as individuals and communities. So there is no question at issue on that point. Peace men and men-killers perfectly agree as to the right of self-defence.

But the means—here we are at issue. The peace men say, suffer and die yourself, and thus overcome evil. The war man says—influct

suffering and death on the evil doer. Property liberty and life are never to be defended by taking, or endangering the life of the aggressor—by individuals or governments—the fundamental principle of all efficient efforts to promote peace. The contrary is the foundation principle of all war and slavery. There could be no war, no slavery, no anarchy, no bloodshed, on the non-killing principle. That life may be taken as a penalty for crime, or in self-defence, is the favorite doctrine of warriors, of tyrants, of slaveholders, of murderers, and pirates—the principle which has made the earth the great slaughter-house of the human race. The contrary principle never shed a drop of blood.

Now suppose A Conservative (not indeed of life, peace and order, but of the ferocious principle that it is right to kill, slay, and destroy.) in self-defence, thinks it right for individuals and society to take life in self-defence. Somebody must say when, how, and in defence of what life may be taken. He assumes the power of life and death over man. Who shall limit the exercise of this power? Who say when it may be exerted? I deny that God has told us for what individuals or society are to take life. A Conservative will not, I presume, pretend that the Christian's only guide has determined the crimes or the acts for which life may be taken. It follows then, that this momentous question is to be settled by man—that God has invested man with the tremendous power of life and death over man, and left it to his reason, conscience, judgment, or DISCRETION to say when, how, and for what life may be taken. This is the ground taken by Blackstone, by every Constitution of the United States and by all human governments. It was the principle on which the Pilgrims acted when in 1675 they passed the following order:

"It is ordered by the court that whosoever shall shoot off any gun on any necessary occasion, or at any game whatsoever, except at an Indian or a wolf, shall forfeit five shillings for every such shot, but further liberty be given."—Laws of Plymouth Col. 176.

Man, the image and representative of God on earth, classed with wolves, and made lawful game—to be shot down like a wolf as man shall see fit!

On this principle the Puritans acted, when in 1637, they butchered the Pequods—which is related by one in the following story. 'The number destroyed was about 400. It was a fearful sight to see them lying in the fire, and the streams of blood quenching the same, and the horrible scent thereof—but the victory seemed a SWEET SACRIFICE, and they gave the PRAISE THERE-OF TO GOD.' For this horrible principle A Conservative pleads, when he pleads for the right to take life in self-defence, unless he will show that God has defined the limits of this dreadful power over life in the hand of man.

A Conservative indeed! but of a principle which has made this earth the charnel-house of a slaughtered race; which has plunged the nations, kingdoms and governments of this world into an ocean of blood. Against such a principle, as a man and a Christian, I would in the name of God and humanity proclaim war—never-ending war—till the principle, and every blood-stained system built upon it, be destroyed. All Conservatives of this man-killing principle, must give up Christianity. All Conservatives of Christianity, must abandon that principle—for light and darkness, sin and holiness, love and hate, life and death, are not more opposite. So the question at issue is—

DISCRETIONARY POWER OVER LIFE,  
OR  
NO POWER. H. C. W.

THE WAGES OF INQUIRY TO THE TREASURY OF THE LORD.—The following item of information appeared not long since in the Washington Christian Statesman. We have not seen it in any northern paper:

"We observe with pleasure that the Rev. John C. Smith, of Georgetown, has been very successful in his efforts for the American Tract Society, during a tour of a few weeks in South Carolina and Georgia, having acknowledged in the Charleston Observer the receipt of about \$2000 for that excellent institution."

Had the American Tract Society sent Rev. John Smith, or any other agent, to collect funds among the priests of Juggernaut, or even among the unimpres of our own neighboring race-grounds, for circulating Christian tracts, the whole Christian world would have cried out at the profanation. And yet we doubt not that the worshippers of horses would have cheerfully contributed a still larger sum than \$2000, for that excellent institution, if they could thereby have obtained an implied acquiescence of those whom the Tract Society represents, in their claims to be considered as good citizens and good Christians as others. And certainly, the whippers of men and women may well consider it a cheap purchase to have gained such a testimony of Christian fellowship and confidence from the Tract Society at the price of only 'about' two thousand dollars. Why, they would give a million a year, rather than lose it. But the day is not far distant, when they will find to their sadness, that the fellowship of the church for slavery is what money will not buy.—Emancipator.

FREE DISCUSSION.—A late number of the Missionary Herald contains an instructive and cheering account of a public discussion between the missionaries and the Hindoos on the merits of the Hindoo religion. This reminds us of the primitive age of Christianity, when its divine Founder held daily disputations with the scribes and Pharisees—when the synagogues, the market and the sea shore were the theatres of free and public debate—when Paul challenged the Grecian philosophers on Mars Hill, and disputed daily in the school of one Tyrannus. There was no fear of impairing the sublimity of religion by making its discussions too common—no panic lest places of religious instruction should become the arena of debate—no fear that the dignity of the Christian ministry would suffer, by meekly instructing opposers—no sensitiveness lest the Holy Spirit should be grieved, or lest the piety of the true worshippers should evaporate, the first moment the truths of religion should be treated as literal facts, and human beings encouraged to treat them as facts by making them the topics of free social discussion. When shall the infidelity, and error, and superstition, and impurity, and heathenism, of the United States of America be assailed by a band of Christian ministers, who like their divine Master and his apostles, shall invite free public discussion, and go out into the highways and hedges to carry on the moral warfare? Abolitionists have made a few experiments at discussion in respect to one of the giant sins of our land. Who will profit by the hint, and put on the whole armor of God, and go forth to the contest? We ought to have a good many teachers of religion in this country, who are thoroughly educated and trained for such public debates.—Friend of Man.

TEXAS NOT ANNIHILATED! We congratulate the country on the cheering fact, that Congress has adjourned without annexing Texas to the United States. So far, so good. Dr. Esik may say what he pleases, and editors of various sorts may misstate as often as they choose the senseless inquiry, 'What have abolitionists accomplished?' The South loudly complains, the Texas Legislature has attested, and the world knows, that Abolitionists, with the help of the equally villainous John Quincy Adams, have done for the present the best they could. The abolitionists without Mr. Adams, or Mr. Adams without the abolitionists, could not probably have effected the object. But both together, have been too strong for the slaveholders. Ask Mr. Adams whether he thinks abolitionists have done nothing to avert this calamity.—Z.

## DOCTRINAL.

For the Liberator.

## THOUGHTS ON CHRISTIAN PERFECTION AND IMPERFECTION.—No. 4.

Having considered the nature of the perfection and imperfection of the saints in this life, I will now conclude with several general observations.

1. Real saints are singular creatures. They greatly differ from every body else—are unlike the holy angels, unlike the fallen angels. They widely differ from unregenerate sinners, for they have some 'perfect love which casteth out fear,' and which is 'the fulfilling of the law,' and sinners have none. They are 'complete in Christ,' and joint heirs with him to the amazing treasures and blessedness of his heavenly kingdom, but sinners are out of the ark of safety. In changing their principles and course of conduct, sinners are commonly much more inconsistent than saints—but in changing their affections from good to bad, and from bad to good, saints are the inconsistent ones. Their holy exercises have such an effect upon their consciences and hearts as to spoil them for the pleasures, honors, friendship and customs of the world. Their sinful exercises greatly disturb their christian rest and enjoyment, and plunge them into sorrow and shame, but still they are the only persons who have true happiness. They are singular in making themselves 'of no reputation' for Christ's sake and the gospel's sake; for, their good frames of mind have a surprising effect upon their general course of conduct, and lead them to expose, relate, and reprove those popular errors and vices, and to enforce and defend those self-denying truths which will always bring obloquy and persecution. Witness the worthies spoken of in the 11th of Hebrews, who 'confessed they were pilgrims and strangers on the earth'; and who 'were stoned, were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheep skins and goat skins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented.' (Of whom the world was not worthy.) They wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth.'—How singular were they? Said Paul, (1 Cor. 4: 13) 'Being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat: we are made as the filth of the world, and are the offscouring of all things unto this day.' Again (2 Cor. 6: 4) 'In much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings; By pureness, by knowledge, by long suffering, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by honor and dishonor, by evil report and good report; as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things. Such singular creatures are the saints. The world cannot appreciate their motives and conduct, and are ready to call them insane. Said Christ, 'If they have called the master of the house, Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household.' How singular was Jeremiah who said, 'Wo is me my mother, that thou hast borne me a man of strife and a man of contention to the whole earth.' Real saints are very singular in the practice of self-denial, as we may infer from these words of Christ, (Luke 14) 'If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yet, and his own life also cannot be my disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple. So likewise whosoever he be of you, that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple.' (John 12: 25) 'He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal.' Agreeably to the letter and spirit of these terms of discipleship, the primitive Christians who were christians indeed, sold their possessions, and disencumbered themselves from the world, and thus denied themselves to follow Christ. How singular were they. They were equally singular in practising universal love to enemies, non-resistance towards injurers, and in returning good for evil. Real saints are singular in rejoicing in God and trusting in him in the darkest and most trying times. They are equally singular in mourning and sorrowing in themselves for their sins and follies. Their sins are such a burden to them that they are ready to cry out from time to time, 'O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death.' The lives of saints are a chequered scene of sinning and repenting, of obeying and disobeying God and his law, of trusting and distrust, submitting and rebelling. Though they often sin, yet the world is tormented with the doctrines they believe and teach, and with the duties they perform. The holy exercises they have, exert a very powerful influence upon their general character and conduct, and prevent them from forming and executing those plans and enterprises of injustice, cruelty, oppression and wickedness which others often adopt; and prevent them from boasting and praising themselves, and denying and covering their sins as others do. They prevent them from living in those practices of known and obvious sin which are incompatible with the life of a real saint. Still they often backslide from holiness, forsake the narrow way of self-denial, and fall like Peter and like him repent. These, it is believed, are some of the singularities of the real saints of God, as described in the bible. Reader, have you these marks of discipleship? Have you any of these singular features of the saints strongly developed? Search and see.

2. If the true character of saints has been justly described, it is of very great importance for christians to tell each other their faults, and give the proper reproof and admonition. Though God considers his saints to be his jewels, and delights in their petitions, yet he sees much in them to blame and to chastise. Accordingly an apostle says, (Heb. 12: 6) 'My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him: For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening of God, deal with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? Now no chastening for the present seemeth joyful, but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby.' This discipline is to correct their errors and sins. And in no thing can saints more effectually be 'labors together with God,' and profit each other, than by plainly telling each other their errors and faults, especially their deceitful, shameful and daring ones, and by giving the proper advice, warning and reproof. When severity is called for, we ought to be severe, for an apostle says, (Titus, 1: 13) 'Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith.' Again we read, (Lev. 19: 17) 'Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart: thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him.' Reader, are you faithful in this respect, or false?

If the character of saints has been justly delineated, have we not reason to believe that, in the sight of God, they are in general more criminal than others of similar capacities. This may be a paradox and strike some minds as absurd and incredible. Let us examine.

1. Saints transgress the law of God with great frequency. We commonly judge of moral conduct by human laws, customs, rights, relations, prejudices and feelings. But God who 'seeth not as man seeth,' judges by a different standard. In his view, all the violations of divine laws, rights and relations are sins, and sins of the first magnitude. Said David to God, though he had sinned in a very aggravated manner against his neighbor, (50 Ps.) 'Against thee, O Lord, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight.' He viewed the outrage against his neighbor, as nothing in comparison with the sin against God. The rights, prerogatives and relations of God to us, are very numerous, and our obligations to him are very sacred and binding. His law has infinitely more authority to bind us to obedience than any human law can have, and we are under inexpressibly greater obligations to regard his feelings and wishes than those of our fellow creatures. And his law, which is exceedingly broad, and is the true standard of moral conduct, binds us to fulfill all our obligations towards God, as well as towards man. Let saints judge themselves by this standard, and they will see that they sin with great frequency. We have reason to believe that saints in this life have vastly more sinful than holy exercises.

The sins of believers are more heinous and criminal than those of unbelievers. They sin against greater light than others. They have been 'called out of darkness into God's marvelous light,' and have 'a spiritual discerning of spiritual things' which others have not; for we read, 'The way of the wicked is as darkness; they know not at what they stumble.' It is said of saints, 'For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of his glory in the face of Jesus Christ.' Again, 'Ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord.' Selfish affections and sinful conduct, therefore, must be much more criminal in saints, according to Christ's maxim, 'This is the condemnation that light has come into the world, &c.

Saints violate more relations when they sin than others do. By regeneration they become 'the sons of God,' joint heirs with Christ, and members of his spiritual body. As soon as these relations are formed, new and corresponding obligations arise, which are violated whenever they sin against God or against Zion. The violation of these peculiar obligations greatly increases their guilt. The sins of believers also involve a violation of promises, covenants, and voluntary obligations between them and God, which greatly increases the guilt of them. Saints enter into covenant with God at regeneration, and by uniting with the visible church, they enter into covenant with his people. The vows of God are upon them. These voluntary obligations render their sins acts of perfidy, treachery, and promise-breaking, which greatly augments the guilt of them.

The sins of believers are more criminal in the sight of God, because more ungrateful than the sins of others. God has done more for them than he has for others. He has raised them from death unto life—shed abroad his love in their hearts—given them a new heart and a new spirit, and caused them to become his children and heirs. He chose them in Christ before the world began, and in fulfilling his gracious purpose, has made them new creatures, and entitled them to all the glorious promises and provisions of the gospel. These acts of divine power and grace lay saints under peculiar obligations of gratitude, thankfulness and praise, and render their sins against God far more criminal than others. What is baser, or more odious than ingratitude? And where can be found such examples of ingratitude as the sins of believers against God and his cause?

Now, if believers have far more sinful than holy affections—if they sin against superior light—if they violate more relations—break more promises and covenants—and are guilty of baser ingratitude than unbelievers, have we not good reasons to conclude that they are chargeable with more criminality in the sight of God, than others of similar capacities? So Paul appears to have viewed himself, for he said to Timothy (1 Tim. 1: 15), 'This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief.' This idea is not at all incompatible with the fact that they have some 'perfect love' which 'is the fulfilling of the law,' and in which God delights. If to whom little is forgiven the same little will be forgiven (Luke 7: 47), the peculiar guilt of saints, and corresponding divine forgiveness towards them, may be the occasion of their loving and enjoying each other hereafter.

3. If the character of saints has been truly delineated, according to 'the law and the testimony,' then it is believed the schemes of human perfectionists, as advocated by those persons called 'Perfectionists,' cannot be maintained. There can be no doubt that permanent sinless perfection, as required in the law of God, is a plain, practicable, imperious and most delightful duty. But it is a plain matter of fact that the most eminent patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and primitive christians, did not attain to such a state. It is evident that Paul did not attain to such a state, and who can believe that modern (so called) Perfectionists are more holy than the great and successful apostle to the Gentiles? It is evident that Job did not attain to such a state, and who can believe that modern professed perfectionists are more righteous than the devout patriarch of Uz? It appears that Daniel did not attain to such a state, but confessed his own, as well as his people's sins, and who can believe that those who think themselves perfect, are more beloved in heaven than Daniel? I should greatly rejoice to see persons giving good evidence of having attained a permanent state of sinless perfection. But I fear those who imagine they have attained such a state, are in great danger of thinking more highly of themselves, than they ought to think. I also fear that they have mistaken or perverted the true and only standard of moral perfection, and are building their houses upon the sand. There have been believers in human perfectionism among different denominations in past ages, but they have manifested gross ignorance of the true character and law of God as revealed in the Bible, and as demonstrable from reason. They have commonly been either theoretical or practical Antinomians, who have rejected the true standard of moral conduct, and thought that God was altogether such a one as themselves in his moral character. This scheme has not included the essential rights and prerogatives of God, and has not embraced all the essential rights of man. Some have built their scheme of pretended perfection on those passages of scripture which assert that saints do not and cannot sin, while obeying God and his law, and vainly concluded that none ever sin after sanctification. But this is contrary to plain facts. Some have built a scheme of pretended perfection upon those texts which assert that the Jewish dispensation, and the rites peculiar to the Mosaic dispensation, are abolished, and have inferred that the moral law of God which requires sinless perfection, is no longer binding, vainly imagining that the gospel standard of perfection is of a different nature. But this is absurd, and contrary to the whole current of the New Testament. Some have seized hold of that class of texts which assert that believers are complete in Christ, entirely pardoned, justified and safe, and have fondly and vainly imagined that being thus complete in Christ, involves freedom from sin and guilt. This is the most common ground on which such schemes have been built. Some have supposed there is a mysterious transfer of

Christ's righteousness to the saints, and of all their sins to him, so that they become immaculate. But such a transfer is impossible in the nature of things. Every effort to prove the permanent sinless perfection of saints, as being in Christ, or united with him, is completely refuted by one plain fact—God chastises all his children for their sins. (Heb. 12: 8.) 'If ye are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons.' Though believers in Christ are free from the threatenings of the law of God; are free from condemnation, and not bound to abide by the legal method of justification, but are under grace, it does not follow from this that they are not bound by the precepts of God's moral law, which is the true, and only true standard of moral perfection. Such a view of the gospel rejects the moral law of God in its true and proper extent, as the only rule of duty, and standard of sin, and subverts the foundation of true religion and righteousness. Though saints can truly say that 'their old man is crucified with Christ,' and that all their hopes of salvation, on the ground of works are perished, it does not follow from this, or from any other part of the true gospel, that saints are so dead to selfishness, and to the world, as to be established in a permanent state of sinless perfection.

Ever since the fall, the carnal minds of men have been 'enmity against God,' not subject to his law, neither induced can be. And multitudes have tried in various ways, to explain the gospel so as to reject the holy law of God as the true and only standard of moral perfection, and rule of duty. But all such efforts are perfectly vain. God's moral law is founded in the immutable nature and relation of things, and can no more cease to bind men's consciences, than they can cease to exist. And every ground on which a scheme of human perfectibility has been built, which excludes God's law as the true and only standard of moral conduct, is 'like the less fabric of a vision.' It is difficult to conceive a more unscriptural, delusive and visionary notion than the scheme of Christian perfectibility, advocated by professed Perfectionists, since 'every man at his best estate, is altogether unperfected.'—C. S.

Saints violate more relations when they sin than others do. By regeneration they become 'the sons of God,' joint heirs with Christ, and members of his spiritual body. As soon as these relations are formed, new and corresponding obligations arise, which are violated whenever they sin against God or against Zion. The violation of these peculiar obligations greatly increases their guilt. The sins of believers also involve a violation of promises, covenants, and voluntary obligations between them and God, which greatly increases the guilt of them. Saints enter into covenant with God at regeneration, and by uniting with the visible church, they enter into covenant with his people. The vows of God are upon them. These voluntary obligations render their sins acts of perfidy, treachery, and promise-breaking, which greatly augments the guilt of them.

The sins of believers are more criminal in the sight of God, because more ungrateful than the sins of others. God has done more for them than he has for others. He has raised them from death unto life—shed abroad his love in their hearts—given them a new heart and a new spirit, and caused them to become his children and heirs. He chose them in Christ before the world began, and in fulfilling his gracious purpose, has made them new creatures, and entitled them to all the glorious promises and provisions of the gospel. These acts of divine power and grace lay saints under peculiar obligations of gratitude, thankfulness and praise, and render their sins against God far more criminal than others. What is baser, or more odious than ingratitude? And where can be found such examples of ingratitude as the sins of believers against God and his cause?

Now, if believers have far more sinful than holy affections—if they sin against superior light—if they violate more relations—break more promises and covenants—and are guilty of baser ingratitude than unbelievers, have we not good reasons to conclude that they are chargeable with more criminality in the sight of God, than others of similar capacities? So Paul appears to have viewed himself, for he said to Timothy (1 Tim. 1: 15), 'This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief.' This idea is not at all incompatible with the fact that they have some 'perfect love' which 'is the fulfilling of the law,' and in which God delights. If to whom little is forgiven the same little will be forgiven (Luke 7: 47), the peculiar guilt of saints, and corresponding divine forgiveness towards them, may be the occasion of their loving and enjoying each other hereafter.

4. If the character of saints has been truly delineated, according to 'the law and the testimony,' then it is believed the schemes of human perfectibility, as advocated by those persons called 'Perfectionists,' cannot be maintained. There can be no doubt that permanent sinless perfection, as required in the law of God, is a plain, practicable, imperious and most delightful duty. But it is a plain matter